

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/580,727	07/03/2007	Henrik Stender	60218(48497)	6468
	7590 08/03/201 NGELL PALMER & F	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 558	74	DUFFY, PATRICIA ANN		
BOSTON, MA	. 02205		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1645	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/03/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/580,727	STENDER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Patricia A. Duffy	1645		

	Patricia A. Duffy	1645				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 28 July 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE				
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of th application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A on event, however, will the statutory prior for reply expire is Examiner Note: if box 1 is checked, check either box (a) O/MONTH'S OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period act under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>						
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t They raise new issues that would require further cor They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	sideration and/or search (see NO		cause			
 They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or 	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally rejections	ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, i	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of			
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 4-13,25,26,30 and 62.						
Claim(s) rejected: 4-13,25,20,30 and 62. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 51-61.						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing- entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).					
	/Patricia A. Duffy/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1645				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 112, first paragraph witten description and enablement and 112 second paragraph rejections as the dependent claims 4-13 merely characterize the function of the probes of claim 25..

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The amendment to the claims does not obviate the 103 rejection of record. Applicants again extensively argue the particulars of the method of detection using specific lables and using an admixture of the probes consisting of three probes and one label. It is noted that the claims are not so limited. The probe set is open language and can include other probes including those on a chip. The probes do not have to have the same labels as argued and the set is not limited to an admixture of the probes of SEQ ID NOL6, 7 and 8. Applicants argue particular method steps that lead to a detection of a cohort of species by one fluorescent label. The claims are not limited and as explained in the prior office action the claims are not limited to a probe set consisting of an admixture of SEQ ID NO.6, 7, and 8 having the same fluorescent label and a single species with a second fluorescent label end or single species with a second fluorescent label. The claims are directed to product not the same probe set is obvious over the probes of the prior art that are described for detection and suitable for inclusion on a chip. The rejection under 103 is maintained for reasons made of record.